

Ed - F.Y.I.

file
TITL

February 21, 1989

Dr. Fred Schultz
Vice President
Research and Development
Lorillard
P. O. Box 21688
Greensboro, N.C. 27420

Dear Fred:

As a recent appointee to the Board of Directors, Tobacco Institute Testing Laboratory, I requested that some form of inter-laboratory testing should be conducted. I based my request on internal comparison of data generated within Philip Morris laboratories and that obtained in Dr. Steele's laboratory.

The comparative testing of six cigarette types for tar and nicotine has been completed by seven laboratories established to test cigarette performance using the FTC procedure. Two such comparative tests were conducted in 1988: The results of these tests were summarized by Dr. William Steele in correspondence dated September 15 and December 29, 1988. The degree of cooperation among the tobacco industrial laboratories and Dr. Steele's laboratory in undertaking such a request was first rate. Now that both sets of data have been reviewed by all laboratories involved in these tests, the following observations may be made:

1. TITL data tends to be higher than any of the other six laboratories for full flavored and higher tar delivery brands;
2. R. J. Reynolds and Brown & Williamson laboratories generate tar data that is equivalent; and
3. The remaining laboratories generate internally consistent data but external comparisons of data between laboratories would be difficult if not impossible due to indeterminate variations in methodology and/or unspecified conditions.

Based upon my assessment of these data, I recommend that the Board of Directors of TITL institute domestic cigarette testing using two monitor cigarettes. We at Philip Morris are prepared to provide sufficient quantities of these monitor cigarettes to all current member companies of

PM3000878925

the Board of Directors. One of these monitors should deliver 9-10 mg tar and the other should deliver 17-19 mg tar by the FTC procedure. The filter of the 17-19 mg tar monitor would be unventilated. Thus each laboratory would "calibrate" each of their smoking machines on cigarettes which represent about 90% of all cigarettes sold in this country. The main reason for analyzing two monitor cigarettes would be to insure standardization of the testing protocol throughout the bulk of the tar-delivery range of commercial cigarettes. Secondly, I recommend that comparative studies between our industrial laboratories and TITL be conducted semi-annually to insure consistent data among the laboratories. It must be emphasized that consistent data for the monitor cigarettes are the main objective, but such consistency in the data is highly unlikely without some airflow measurement and control.

Since the companies within the industry have agreed to accept TITL values for tar and nicotine in advertisements, I firmly believe that modifications of the existing protocol is essential.

Please arrange a meeting of the Board of Directors of TITL at the earliest possible date. The agenda items at this meeting should be those items enumerated above.

Sincerely,

William F. Kuhn
Director
R&D Support

/mro

The Board of Directors of TITL

Mr. Ray C. Hilliard
Dr. Preston H. Leake
Mr. Larry A. Lyerly
Mr. James F. Nall
Dr. W. L. Steele

PM3000878926